



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,080	12/22/2000	Mai-Ian Tomsen	4000.2.10	3248
32641	7590	08/12/2004	EXAMINER	
DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP 201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100 ONE UTAH CENTER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2611		

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/748,080	TOMSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dominic D Saltarelli	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4, 6, 7</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 4 reads "using the indication the channel to identify a content source" and should read -- using the indication *of* the channel --. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 48 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 4 reads "using the indication the channel to identify a content source" and should read -- using the indication *of* the channel --. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the list of items" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. Claim 54 recites the limitation "the list of items" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 14, 17, 31-34, 39-39, 44, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Palmer (5,438,355).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 31, and 32, Palmer discloses a method and system for selectively retrieving and displaying supplemental content related to a television program being displayed by an interactive television system (col. 2, lines 45-58, col. 1, lines 55-60), the system comprising:

A remote control device (fig. 2, remote control 34) for the interactive television system (col. 3, lines 54-63), the remote control device comprising a specifically designated button (response button 56, col. 3 line 63 – col. 4 line 2) for requesting supplemental content related to the television program (col. 4, lines 2-14); and

A set top box (fig. 2, set top 14) for the interactive television system, the set top box being configured to obtain contextual information pertaining to the television program being displayed (program identification codes, PIC, col. 3, lines 5-33, which are read by code reader 40, col. 3, lines 41-46), send an information request comprising the contextual information (col. 4, lines 4-9) to a content source (fig. 1, television broadcaster 24 and central exchange 10), and retrieve supplemental content from the content source for display (on the TV screen) by the interactive television system (col. 4, lines 38-48) in response to the content source identifying supplemental content related to the television program based upon the contextual information (col. 4, lines 10-14).

Regarding claims 3 and 33, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 31, and further discloses the contextual information comprises an indication of the television program being displayed (PIC's uniquely identify the content to which they pertain, col. 3, lines 5-10).

Regarding claims 4 and 34, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 3 and 33, and further discloses the set top box is further configured to read the indication of the television program from vertical blanking interval data associated with the television program (VITC, col. 3, lines 19-25).

Regarding claims 6 and 36, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 3 and 33, and further discloses a search engine configured to search the content source for supplemental content related to the indication of the television program (col. 4, lines 10-14).

Regarding claims 7 and 37, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 31, and further disclose the contextual information comprises a time index (vertical interval time codes, col. 3, lines 19-25).

Regarding claims 8 and 38, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 7 and 37, and further disclose the time index indicates a time at which the user command is received (the time code [VITC], represents a specific broadcast

portion, col. 3, lines 5-10, 19-25, and the time code being read at the time of user input represents the time at which that user command is received, col. 3 line 63 – col. 4 line 4).

Regarding claims 9 and 39, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 7 and 37, and further discloses a search engine configured to search the content source for supplemental content related to a particular time segment of the television program based upon the time index (PIC information is in the form of time index codes [VITC], col. 4, lines 2-14).

Regarding claims 14 and 44, Palmer disclose the method and system of claims 1 and 31, and further discloses the information request comprises an identifier of the interactive television system (CIC, col. 3, lines 33-40 and col. 4, lines 2-9).

Regarding claims 17 and 47, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 14 and 44, and further discloses the content source is configured to send the identified supplemental content to an interactive television system associated with the identifier (identification of console 14 through use of CIC data, col. 4, lines 10-18).

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5, 21-23, 35, and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Yen et al. (5,991,799) [Yen].

Regarding claims 5 and 35, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 3 and 33, but fails to disclose the set top is further configured to read the indication of the television program from electronic programming guide data associated with the television program.

In an analogous art, Yen teaches an interactive television system (fig. 1) wherein electronic programming guide data is received (col. 7, lines 10-25), said programming guide data providing very comprehensive data regarding received content (subject matter, locality values, content ratings, col. 7, lines 29-67), allowing for detailed “crosslinking” of content and content sources when retrieving supplemental information regarding a television program (col. 8 line 57 – col. 9 line 12).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer to include further configuring the set top to read the indication of the television program from electronic programming guide data associated with the television program, as taught by Yen, for the benefit of retrieving very comprehensive indication data

regarding the television program for a more detailed and relevant search for supplemental content related to the television program.

Regarding claims 21 and 51, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 31, but fails to disclose the set top box is further configured to receive a list of supplemental content items from the content source in response to a search by the content source, receive a user selection of a supplemental content item from the list, send the user selection to the content source, and retrieve from the content source the selected supplemental content item for display by the interactive television system.

In an analogous art, Yen teaches the display of a menu of located (by background element 121, col. 11, lines 4-24) supplemental content items to a user (foreground element displays a set of information items to a user, col. 11, lines 25-40), wherein the user selects one of the content items, and upon selection, retrieving the requested content for display (col. 13, lines 8-18), allowing the user to select the content that he/she is most interested in.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer to include presenting a list of supplemental content items to a user, who then selects an item from the list, and then retrieves said content item for display, as taught by Yen, wherein the list would be retrieved from the content source and the request for the supplemental content item would be retrieved by the content source, as Palmer discloses the

content source (Palmer, fig. 1, broadcaster 24 and central exchange 10) to perform both the searching and retrieval of supplemental content items (Palmer, col. 4, lines 10-14). The reason for doing so is to focus the transmission of supplemental content items to only those that are of express interest to users.

Regarding claims 22, 23, 52, and 53, Yen further discloses the use of uniform resource locator (URL) links as a means to access content from content sources (content from web pages, which is accessed using URLs, is a source of content for presentation, col. 6, lines 21-26), for the benefit of retrieving diverse, web-based content.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer and Yen to include URL links to supplemental content, as taught by Yen, for the benefit of including the diversity of web-based content in the list of available supplemental content.

10. Claims 10, 18, 40, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer Feinleib (6,637,032).

Regarding claims 10 and 40, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 31, but fails to disclose the contextual information comprises at least one keyword obtained from closed captioning text associated with the television program.

In an analogous art, Feinleib teaches an interactive television system (fig. 1) wherein keywords from closed captioning data are used for associating a broadcast program with supplemental information at specific points (col. 6, lines 22-41), thus using information which is very specific and precisely identifies the particular content of the broadcast (col. 6, lines 38-41).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer to include closed captioning keywords associated with the television program in the retrieved contextual information, as taught by Feinleib, for the benefit of retrieving contextual information that identifies the subject matter of television programming for which supplemental content has been requested, for more detailed and relevant retrieval of supplemental content.

Regarding claims 18 and 48, Palmer disclose the method and system of claims 1 and 31, but fails to disclose the contextual information comprises a channel being displayed and using the indication of the channel to identify a content source to receive the information request.

In an analogous art, Feinleib discloses supplying supplemental information from a particular content source which relates to a particular channel (col. 1, lines 43-51), for the benefit of enhancing a particular channel with a dedicated source of supplemental content.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer to include supplying supplemental information from a particular content source which relates to a particular channel, as taught by Feinleib, such that the contextual information would include a channel being displayed, thus identifying the content source to receive the information request, for the benefit of enhancing the particular channel being watch with a dedicated source of supplemental content.

11. Claims 11 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Feinleib as applied to claims 10 and 40 above, and further in view of Taylor, Jr. (6,299,094) [Taylor].

Regarding claims 11 and 41, Palmer and Feinleib disclose the method and system of claims 10 and 40, but fail to disclose a search engine is present to search the content source for supplemental content comprising the at least one keyword.

In an analogous art, Taylor teaches a search engine (fig. 5, search interface 531) which searches for content based on keywords (col. 8, lines 10-19), of closed captioning text (the keywords are searched for in closed caption text, col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 24), enabling a focused search for all relevant content (database search results, col. 8, lines 25-40).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer and Feinleib to include a search

engine for searching for content based on received keywords, as taught by Taylor, (wherein searching takes place at the content source, Palmer, col. 4, lines 10-14), for the benefit of enabling a focused search for all relevant content which the user has expressed interest in.

12. Claims 12 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer, Feinleib, and Taylor, as applied to claims 11 and 41, and further in view of Kenner et al. (5,956,716) [Kenner] and Yen.

Regarding claims 12 and 42, Palmer, Feinleib, and Taylor disclose the method and system of claims 11 and 41, but fail to disclose a search engine configured, in response to supplemental content comprising the at least one keyword not being found at the content source, to search a global network for supplemental content comprising the at least one keyword, wherein the set top box is further configured to retrieve the supplemental content from the global information network for display by the interactive television system.

In an analogous art, Kenner teaches a content retrieval system (fig. 4, col. 7, lines 23-34) wherein users request content from a content source (users request video clips from local SRU, col. 8, lines 51-65), which then searches for the content at the source (local search for video clips is performed first, col. 9, lines 15-20, 42-45), and if the requested content is not found at the content source, the search is expanded over a global information network (request is forwarded to the PIM 22, col. 9, lines 42-54, which searches for the requested

Art Unit: 2611

information, col. 10, lines 10-12 and col. 8, lines 18-25, over a global network [widely distributed data sources, col. 12, lines 33-35, connected by the internet, col. 20, lines 50-63]), thus retrieving information from the broadest and most diverse source of information available, the internet, (col. 5, lines 39-55 and col. 20 line 10 – col. 21 line 16).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer, Feinleib, and Taylor to include searching for content over a global network if it is not available at the content source, as taught by Kenner, for the benefit of retrieving the supplemental information from the widest and most diverse source of information available, the internet.

In an analogous art, Yen teaches retrieving supplemental information from a global information network for display by the interactive television system (internet access point 112 retrieves information from the internet, col. 5, lines 16-37, for supplemental display to a television program, col. 8 line 67 – col. 9 line 12), providing the user with direct access to the internet for retrieving supplemental content.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer, Feinleib, Taylor, and Kenner to include retrieving supplemental information from a global information network for display, as taught by Yen, for the benefit of direct retrieval of the supplemental content from its location in the global network.

13. Claims 13, 30, 43, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Kenner and Yen.

Regarding claims 13 and 43, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 31, but fails to disclose a search engine configured, in response to supplemental content comprising the at least one keyword not being found at the content source, to search a global network for supplemental content comprising the at least one keyword, wherein the set top box is further configured to retrieve the supplemental content from the global information network for display by the interactive television system.

In an analogous art, Kenner teaches a content retrieval system (fig. 4, col. 7, lines 23-34) wherein users request content from a content source (users request video clips from local SRU, col. 8, lines 51-65), which then searches for the content at the source (local search for video clips is performed first, col. 9, lines 15-20, 42-45), and if the requested content is not found at the content source, the search is expanded over a global information network (request is forwarded to the PIM 22, col. 9, lines 42-54, which searches for the requested information, col. 10, lines 10-12 and col. 8, lines 18-25, over a global network [widely distributed data sources, col. 12, lines 33-35, connected by the internet, col. 20, lines 50-63]), thus retrieving information from the broadest and most diverse source of information available, the internet, (col. 5, lines 39-55 and col. 20 line 10 – col. 21 line 16).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer to include searching for content over a global network if it is not available at the content source, as taught by Kenner, for the benefit of retrieving the supplemental information from the widest and most diverse source of information available, the internet.

In an analogous art, Yen teaches retrieving supplemental information from a global information network for display by the interactive television system (internet access point 112 retrieves information from the internet, col. 5, lines 16-37, for supplemental display to a television program, col. 8 line 67 – col. 9 line 12), providing the user with direct access to the internet for retrieving supplemental content.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer and Kenner to include retrieving supplemental information from a global information network for display, as taught by Yen, for the benefit of direct retrieval of the supplemental content from its location in the global network.

Regarding claims 30 and 60, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 31, but fails to disclose the set top box is further configured to receive a list of supplemental content items from the content source in response to a search of a global information network, receive a user selection of a supplemental content item from the list, and retrieve from the global information

network the selected supplemental content item for display by the interactive television system.

In an analogous art, Kenner teaches a content retrieval system (fig. 4, col. 7, lines 23-34) wherein users request content (col. 8, lines 14-25) which is searched for over a global information network (request is forwarded to the PIM 22, col. 9, lines 42-54, which searches for the requested information, col. 10, lines 10-12 and col. 8, lines 18-25, over a global network [widely distributed data sources, col. 12, lines 33-35, connected by the internet, col. 20, lines 50-63]), thus retrieving information from the broadest and most diverse source of information available, the internet, (col. 5, lines 39-55 and col. 20 line 10 – col. 21 line 16).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer to include searching for content over a global network, as taught by Kenner, for the benefit of retrieving the supplemental information from the widest and most diverse source of information available, the internet.

In an analogous art, Yen teaches the display of a menu of located (by background element 121, col. 11, lines 4-24) supplemental content items to a user (foreground element displays a set of information items to a user, col. 11, lines 25-40), wherein the user selects one of the content items, and upon selection, retrieving (from the internet, when the request is for internet data, col.

5, lines 28-37) the requested content for display (col. 13, lines 8-18), allowing the user to select the content that he/she is most interested in.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer and Kenner to include presenting a list of supplemental content items to a user, who then selects an item from the list, and then retrieves said content item for display, as taught by Yen, wherein the list would be retrieved from the content source, as Palmer discloses it is the content source (Palmer, fig. 1, broadcaster 24 and central exchange 10) that performs the searching for supplemental content items (Palmer, col. 4, lines 10-14). The reason for doing so is to focus the selection of supplemental content items to only those that are of most interest to users.

14. Claims 15, 16, 45, and 46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer.

Regarding claims 15, 16, 45, and 46, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 14 and 44, but fails to disclose the identifier comprises a media access control (MAC) address or an Internet protocol (IP) address.

Examiner takes Official Notice that both MAC and IP addressing are old and well known in the art, and each provide means for uniquely identifying hardware connected to a network, each having the benefit of being nearly universally recognized forms of network identification for use in routing data to specific locations over networks of any size.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer to include the identifier comprises a MAC or IP address, both of which are nearly universally recognized forms of network identification which uniquely identify network hardware for use in routing data over said network.

15. Claims 19, 20, 49, and 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Nishikawa et al. (6,348,932) [Nishikawa].

Regarding claims 19, 20, 49, and 50, Palmer discloses the method and system of claims 1 and 31, but fails to disclose the set to box is configured to simultaneously display the supplemental content with the television content, wherein the displayed television program is reduced in size relative to the size of the displayed supplemental content.

In an analogous art, Nishikawa teaches displaying both the video of a currently selected program along with supplemental content (figs. 10 and 12), wherein the video is displayed in a decimated region of the screen, allowing it and supplemental content (EPG data, ticker region data 566, and DIP data) to be displayed simultaneously (col. 8 line 59 – col. 9 line 6 and col. 12, lines 15-35), for the benefit of perusing supplemental content in interactive television without interrupting or ‘missing’ the broadcast program.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer to include

simultaneously displaying the supplemental content with the television content, wherein the displayed television content is reduced in size (decimated) relative to the size to the displayed supplemental content (video region is reduced in size to allow room for the supplemental content display), as taught by Nishikawa, for the benefit of perusing the supplemental content in the interactive television system without interrupting or ‘missing’ the television content.

16. Claims 24-29 and 54-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer and Nishikawa as applied to claims 20 and 50 above, and further in view of Yen.

Regarding claims 24 and 54, Palmer and Nishikawa disclose the method and system of claims 20 and 50, but fail to disclose a filtering component configured to filter the list of items of supplemental content results based on a set of user preferences.

In an analogous art, Yen teaches filtering information items (col. 9, lines 15-24) based on user preferences (col. 9, lines 36-44), limiting the display of supplemental content items to those most relevant or deemed of most interest to the user.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer and Nishikawa to include a filtering component configured to filter the list of items of supplemental content results based on user preferences, as taught by Yen, for the benefit of

limiting the display of supplemental content items to those most relevant or deemed of most interest by the filtering component to the user.

Regarding claims 25 and 55, Yen further discloses storing the user preferences locally (in information multiplexer 120, col. 9, lines 36-44), as a dedicated device can store detailed preference information about a particular user (explicit and implicit setting of preference information, col. 9 line 66 – col. 10 line 62).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Palmer, Nishikawa, and Yen to include storing the user preferences locally, as taught by Yen, and including them in the information request sent to the content provider, as it is the content provider which performs the search for supplemental content (Palmer, col. 4, lines 10-14), for the benefit of providing detailed user preference information for more effective filtering of supplemental content items.

Regarding claims 26, 27, 28, 29, 56, 57, 58, and 59, Yen further discloses storing very detailed aspects of user preferences (col. 9 line 66 – col. 10 line 62), such aspects including content to exclude (content which falls below an alert threshold is ignored, col. 11, lines 57-65), preferred type of content (col. 9, lines 37-48), preferred source of content (websites and subscription content, col. 9 line 66 – col. 10 line 4), and preferences based on historical analysis of previous

selections from prior lists of content items (col. 10, lines 10-21), all of which provide a high degree of granularity when defining user preferences.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Palmer, Nishikawa, and Yen to include content to exclude, preferred types of content, preferred sources of content, and preferences based on historical analysis of previous selections from prior lists of content items, as taught by Yen, for the benefit of providing a high degree of granularity in user preferences, which increases the effectiveness of any filtering performed based on said preferences.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Reimer et al. (5,559,949) who teaches providing supplemental information to a user during presentation of a movie that is at the viewer's discretion.

18. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) _____ - _____ on _____.
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic D Saltarelli whose telephone number is (703) 305-8660. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (703) 305-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dominic Saltarelli
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2611

DS



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER